

**REMARKS**

Claims 1-14 are all the claims pending in the application.

Claim 12 has been amended to correct its preamble responsive to the objection stated in paragraph 2 of the Office action.

Claim 11 has been amended responsive to the rejection stated in paragraph 3 of the Office action.

In the present Office action, the examiner has rejected claims 1, 2, 4, 6, 7, 11, 12 and 13 as obvious over Hellberg in view of Barazeche, and has indicated claims 3, 5, 8, 9, 10 and 14 as reciting allowable subject matter. Applicant acknowledges with appreciation the indication of allowability of claims 3, 5, 8, 9, 10 and 14, respectfully requests reconsideration of the application and allowance of all claims in view of the above amendments and the following remarks.

Applicant earlier pointed out that Hellberg did not teach a sampling frequency corresponding to a modulation rate, and the examiner has now cited Barazeche for this feature. Barazeche teaches at lines 58-68 of column 4 that a received signal may be sampled at the modulation rate or at a multiple of the modulation rate. However, while Barazeche may teach that a RECEIVED signal can be sampled at the modulation rate, it would not have taught one of skill in the art that a sampling frequency related to the modulation rate should be used in the TRANSMITTER in the manner described in claims 1 and 11 of the present application. The reason for sampling the received signal at the modulation rate at the receive end is to recover the modulated information, and that function is not needed in the transmit processing circuitry and

would not have been obvious in view of Barazeche. Thus, even after reviewing Barazeche, one of skill in the art would not have seen any reason to modify Hellberg to optimize the operation of a *transmitter* in the manner recited in claims 1 and 11.

In view of the above, reconsideration and allowance of this application are now believed to be in order, and such actions are hereby solicited. If any points remain in issue which the Examiner feels may be best resolved through a personal or telephone interview, the Examiner is kindly requested to contact the undersigned at the telephone number listed below.

The USPTO is directed and authorized to charge all required fees, except for the Issue Fee and the Publication Fee, to Deposit Account No. 19-4880. Please also credit any overpayments to said Deposit Account.

Respectfully submitted,

SUGHRUE MION, PLLC  
Telephone: (202) 293-7060  
Facsimile: (202) 293-7860

WASHINGTON OFFICE

**23373**

CUSTOMER NUMBER

Date: February 19, 2009

/DJCushing/  
David J. Cushing  
Registration No. 28,703